



THE CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY

1400 '99 AUG -9 P1:22

5 August 1999

Commissioner Jane Henney
Food and Drug Administration
Parklawn Building, Room 1471
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

Dear Commissioner Henny:

Pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. § 553(e), and the FDA implementing regulations, numerous organizations and individuals have petitioned your office to take action regarding, *inter alia*, the potential human and animal health impacts associated with the spread of transmissible spongiform encephalopathy. See FDA Docket No. 99P-0033/CP1 (filed January 7, 1999). Since the filing of the petitions over almost seven months ago, your office has failed take any action concerning the issues presented by the Humane Farming Association (HFA), the International Center for Technology Assessment's Center for Food Safety and other petitioners. The agency's failure to respond to the citizen petition denies petitioners relief at the agency level and is a constructive denial of the petitioner's request. As such, petitioners intend to pursue other avenues, including judicial review, in order to assure that the agency responds to the issues raised by HFA and others.

Indeed, the agency inaction in this matter is subject to judicial review. Under the APA "agency action" is defined to include "the whole or part of an agency rule, order, license, sanction, relief, or the equivalent denial thereof, *or failure to act*"¹ and gives courts the power to "compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed."² Thus, the APA authorizes courts to review agency decisions to refrain from taking action.³ When administrative inaction has precisely the same impact on the rights of the parties as denial of relief, an agency cannot preclude judicial review by casting its decision in the form of inaction rather than in the form of an order denying relief.⁴

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 551(13) (1995) (emphasis added).

² 5 U.S.C. § 706(1) (1995).

³ Chaney v. Heckler, 718 F.2d 1174, 1183, n. 22 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

⁴ Environmental Defense Fund v. Hardin, 428 F.2d 1093, 1099 (D.C. Cir. 1970).

99P-0033


LET 2

In addition, the agency's inaction is violative of established agency regulations. The FDA has established regulations in which a reasonable period for agency response to citizen petitions can be no more than 180 days.⁵ Regulations which are promulgated by an administrative agency in carrying out its statutory mandate can also provide standards for judicial review of agency action.⁶ Such self-imposed constraints may supply the "law to apply" to overcome the judicial presumption against reviewing administrative inaction.⁷ Thus, the agency must act in a "prompt" manner or be subject to further action. The agency's delay in answering the current petitions amounts to a refusal to act, with sufficient finality and ripeness to permit judicial review.⁸

Furthermore, petitioners remind the FDA that excessive and unreasonable delay in addressing matters brought to its attention by the public saps the public confidence in an agency's ability to discharge its responsibilities and creates uncertainty for the parties, who must incorporate the potential effect of possible agency decision making in the future.⁹

Petitioners request the agency to respond to the aforementioned petition by September 1, 1999. In the absence of an affirmative response, the petitioners will be compelled to consider litigation in order to achieve the full and complete action required to address this violation of federal law.

Sincerely,



Joseph Mendelson, III
Legal Director
Center for Food Safety
c/o International Center for Technology Assessment
310 D Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

CC: Docket No. 99P-0033/CP 1
FDA Dockets Management Branch (Room 1-23)
12420 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20857.

⁵ 21 CFR § 10.30(e)(2) (1998).

⁶ Center for Auto Safety v. Dole, 846 F.2d 1532, 1534 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

⁷ Center for Auto Safety v. Dole, 846 F.2d 1532, 1534 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

⁸ EDF v. Hardin, 428 F.2d at 1100.


⁹ Public Citizen Health Research Group v. Food and Drug Administration, 740 F.2d 21, 32 (D.C. Cir. 1984) quoting Potomac Electric Power Co. v. ICC, 702 F.2d 1026, 1034 (D.C. Cir. 1983).



THE CENTER FOR
FOOD SAFETY

A Project of the International Center for Technology Assessment

310 D Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002



Docket No. 99P-0033
FDA Dockets Management Branch
Room 1-23
12420 Parklawn Drive
Rockville, MD 20857

20852+1728

